United Nations S/PV.7472

Security Council

Seventieth year

Provisional

7472nd meeting
Thursday, 25 June 2015, 10.20 a.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Ibrahim	(Malaysia)
Members:	Angola	Mr. Moura Lucas
	Chad	Mr. Mangaral
	Chile	Ms. Sapag Muñoz de la Peña
	China	Mr. Liu Jieyi
	France	Mr. Lamek
	Jordan	Mrs. Kawar
	Lithuania	Mrs. Jakubonė
	New Zealand	Mr. Taula
	Nigeria	Mrs. Ogwu
	Russian Federation	Mr. Iliichev
	Spain	Mr. Oyarzun Marchesi
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Rycroft
	United States of America	Mr. Pressman
	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	Mr. Méndez Graterol

Agenda

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its eighth session (S/2015/174)a

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the translation of speeches delivered in other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. *Corrections* should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-0506 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org).

15-19386 (E)

Accessible document Please recycle

sThe meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its eighth session (S/2015/174)

The President: In accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite His Excellency Mr. Antonio de Aguiar Patriota, Permanent Representative of Brazil and former Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, to participate in this meeting.

In accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite His Excellency Mr. Olof Skoog, Permanent Representative of Sweden and Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, to participate in this meeting.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

I wish to draw the attention of Council members to document S/2015/174, which contains the report of the Peacebuilding Commission on its eighth session.

I now give the floor to His Excellency Mr. Antonio de Aguiar Patriota, Permanent Representative of Brazil and former Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission.

Mr. De Aguiar Patriota: I wish to highlight some specific elements from the report that I believe deserve the particular attention of the Security Council.

First, the Commission's work over the past year has once again confirmed that its potential as a platform leveraging the political weight of its members in support of peace consolidation should be further utilized. An example of how the Commission can increasingly use its political strength was the collective and determined position it took in the early stages of the Ebola outbreak. The Commission helped spur the international community and other parts of the United Nations system to focus on the risk posed by the crisis to the peacebuilding gains in the three most affected countries. The terms of reference of the United Nations-led Ebola-recovery initiatives have therefore included areas identified by the Commission that deserve special attention in the overall recovery strategies and support programmes.

Secondly, the Commission is uniquely placed to promote greater harmony among the subregional, regional and international dimensions of post-conflict response. One of the Commission's key priority areas in 2014 was therefore to actively engage with its African members and to establish deep and dynamic partnerships with Africa's regional and subregional organizations. Our experience from Guinea-Bissau to Burundi and the Central African Republic confirms that greater regional and subregional coherence is a key factor in support of peacebuilding-related efforts. As we continue to integrate the regional and subregional perspectives into the work of the Commission, we will further strengthen the relevance and weight of its country-specific engagement.

Thirdly, in 2014 the Peacebuilding Commission convened its first-ever annual session with a view to exploring where broader intergovernmental policy development is necessary to help countries reduce the risk of conflict.

As the Commission continued to explore various avenues for predictable financing for peacebuilding, its focus on domestic resource mobilization and the fight against illicit financial flows was a critical step towards identifying possible policy areas requiring Member States' individual and collective action. The challenge posed by illicit financial flows and similar systemic gaps in intergovernmental policy related to financing for peacebuilding highlights the interdependence among security, institutional and socioeconomic initiatives in the promotion of peace.

This was a common point made during the second annual session, which took place two days ago and focused on the challenges for securing predictable financing for peacebuilding. We thank the Swedish Foreign Minister for her presence at the closing ceremony of that session. The Commission will continue to position itself to promote further coherence and synergy among policies and actions across the political, security and developmental dimensions of peace consolidation.

Fourthly, the gender dimension of peacebuilding deserves our continuing attention and unwavering commitment. While women endure the tragic consequences of violent conflicts, they are also key agents for societal transformation in post-conflict societies. The special event that the Commission hosted in collaboration with UN-Women in September 2014

shed light on local peacebuilding initiatives led by women in diverse contexts. This year, the Commission will further explore practical ways of mainstreaming the gender dimension into its country-specific engagements.

Fifthly, defining and improving the nature and scope of its advisory function to the Security Council and the General Assembly continued to be the Commission's main objective in 2014. The Commission is uniquely positioned to complement their work by ensuring that inclusive socioeconomic development contributes to peace and security and reduces the risk of the emergence of violent conflict or relapse into it. The advisory function for both principal organs should help to strengthen the integrated and long-term commitment of the United Nations and other international and regional actors to countries emerging from conflict, something that I stressed in several statements I made on behalf of the Commission at various Security Council briefings and debates in 2014. In that connection, I believe the Council can draw more practically and systematically on the Commission's advice, particularly when mandates of missions are being revisited in the context of changing priorities or of drawdown and transition. That crucial aspect of the Commission's advisory role deserves to be discussed during the informal interactive dialogue to be held later this afternoon under your guidance, Mr. President.

The members of the Commission that are also members of the Security Council, such as Malaysia and Chile, as well as the five permanent members that are also permanent members of the Peacebuilding Commission, are in a unique position to provide leadership, guidance and sustained commitment in order to further deepen and strengthen this advisory function.

Sixthly and finally, the section of the report on the conclusions and forward agenda charts the course of action for the Commission in 2015. The forward agenda reflects the Commission's determination to follow up on key thematic and country-specific approaches that were initiated in 2014, thus ensuring continuity in focus and consistency in approach.

Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 65/7 and Security Council resolution 1947 (2010), the Commission has capitalized on the experience accumulated from its mandated annual reporting to the General Assembly and the Security Council on progress made in taking forward relevant recommendations from the 2010 review of the peacebuilding architecture and initiated advance preparation for the second five-year review, called for by both principal organs, to be conducted this year.

The purpose of the advance preparation was to foster broader ownership of the review among Member States through inclusive and extensive consultations on the objectives, scope, methodology and modalities for conducting the review. The advance preparation reflected agreement among Member States that the challenges facing the countries emerging from conflict should be central to the 2015 review and thus proposed that the review be grounded in specific country studies.

A commitment to help States avoid relapse into conflict was the motivation for the creation in 2005 of the Peacebuilding Commission, the Peacebuilding Support Office and the Peacebuilding Fund. Member States agreed that the 2015 review needed to take that original motivation as its point of departure. The terms of reference for the review were initially developed by and consulted within the Commission and subsequently endorsed by the General Assembly and the Security Council. They should help identify areas of progress and remaining gaps in international assistance to countries emerging from conflict.

The two-stage design of the review, by which an advisory group of experts would undertake country studies and propose actionable and practical recommendations for consideration by the General Assembly and the Security Council, would hopefully ensure that the two principal organs are able to take an informed decision on the future of the United Nations broader peacebuilding architecture. That architecture includes the three components established in 2005, as well as other relevant United Nations operational entities that contribute to building lasting and sustainable peace through a variety of political and programmatic tools. We are looking forward to the imminent release of the report of the advisory group of experts, under the able chairmanship of former Ambassador Gert Rosenthal of Guatemala, and to the initiation of the intergovernmental stage of the review.

I wish to conclude this briefing by acknowledging the role of the Peacebuilding Support Office, of Assistant Secretary-General Oscar Fernandez-Taranco and his predecessor, Judy Cheng-Hopkins, and their team in support of the Commission's work

and activities in 2014. We will continue to count on the Office's support as we seek to pursue the Commission's objectives, as well as on its competent management of the Peacebuilding Fund. Through the work undertaken by the Commission and the Fund, the synergy and complementarity between the political and programmatic dimensions of peacebuilding can bring greater effectiveness to our investment in the country concerned.

The path to healing the scars caused by war and rebuilding the institutions that deliver security, justice, basic services and economic opportunity and that protect fundamental rights is long and fraught with enormous challenges. I am convinced that the efforts of the United Nations in that area should remain people-centred. We must listen actively to the voices of the people who are the most affected by violent conflicts. We must learn from and be guided by their experiences and needs. I believe that in 2015, under the stewardship of Sweden and with the unwavering commitment of its member States, the Peacebuilding Commission can be the locus of such partnerships. I also hope that the ongoing review will generate practical recommendations and the requisite political momentum to adapt and orient the Commission to that end.

The President: I now give the floor to Mr. Skoog.

Mr. Skoog (Sweden): Thank you very much, Mr. President, for the invitation, for convening this meeting and also for the excellent contribution that you presented on behalf of the Security Council at the annual session of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), held earlier this week. And I would like to congratulate the Permanent Representative of Brazil, Ambassador Patriota, for his very strong leadership and commitment during his chairmanship of the Peacebuilding Commission last year.

The world today is torn by more violent conflict than it has been in a very long time, leaving in its wake unprecedented suffering and displacement. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) reported this weekend that more people fled their homes last year than at any time since records began. More than half the people displaced by conflict and persecution are children.

It is against that backdrop that we are meeting today, during this peacebuilding week. Peacebuilding is about preventing relapse into conflict by holistically supporting countries emerging from conflict on a path towards sustained peace. It is therefore about establishing the nexus between security and development. To that end, we need to be more effective and coherent in United Nations activities that assist national peacebuilding efforts.

The expert group report on the 10-year review of the peacebuilding architecture is expected to be submitted very soon. That review, conducted simultaneously with the peace operations review and the high-level review of Security Council resolution 1325 (2000), offers a unique opportunity to strengthen the work of the United Nations in peace and security. I am hopeful that all three will reinvigorate our collective efforts to build and sustain peace.

I would now like to turn to the work of the Commission. I would argue that its vision and usefulness remain as valid as ever. We have to be more effective in addressing the challenge of helping countries transition from war to lasting peace, including by improving strategic planning in the United Nations system; helping countries strengthen their national capacities, including institution-building; ensuring predictable and flexible funding; improving the coordination of international post-conflict activities; and providing a diversified intergovernmental forum that can help ensure greater coherence of support and extend the period of political attention.

I would now like to outline the focus areas of the Peacebuilding Commission during the ongoing ninth session. First, let me turn to peacebuilding in Ebola recovery. The three countries most affected by the Ebola disease outbreak — Liberia, Sierra Leone and Guinea — are all on the PBC agenda. The Commission has been instrumental in ensuring that peacebuilding priorities are addressed as part of the recovery efforts, including the need to accelerate support for institution-building. We will continue to advocate for this, not least at the upcoming high-level meeting on Ebola recovery to be hosted by the Secretary-General in a few weeks' time.

Secondly, with respect to the Peacebuilding Review, as previously mentioned, the work of the advisory group is about to come to an end, since it will submit its report in the next few days. We are eagerly awaiting its analysis and recommendations, and look forward to the findings, which will provide important input for the intergovernmental negotiations. That review can tie into the review of resolution 1325 (2000) on women

and peace and security, as well as the review of peace operations.

Thirdly, there will be a focus on continued support for and coordination with regional organizations, not least the African Union. By drawing on the work initiated last year by my predecessor, Ambassador Patriota, we will identify ways to deepen the dialogue with regional organizations to see how our different comparative advantages can best be utilized.

Fourthly, the Commission will consider the recommendations emanating from the annual session of 2015, held on Tuesday, focusing on the issues of predictable financing for peacebuilding. In addition, the Peacebuilding Commission will continue to move forward with the cross-cutting issues of gender equality and women's empowerment in all peacebuilding efforts. That is a crucial aspect of sustainable peace and development.

I look forward to this afternoon's informal interactive dialogue on post-conflict peacebuilding. It is an important opportunity for us to reflect on how the relationship between the Peacebuilding Commission and the Security Council can be strengthened. Against the backdrop of the UNHCR report this weekend and what we all know to be the untenable strains on the humanitarian system as a whole, I believe we must unite our efforts now to further enhance the effectiveness and coherence of the international response to post-conflict challenges and better support national efforts to avoid conflict and sustain peace.

The President: I thank Mr. Skoog for his briefing.

I now give the floor to the members of the Security Council.

Mr. Rycroft (United Kingdom): Let me begin by thanking Ambassador Patriota and Ambassador Skoog for their briefings today and for all their hard work, past, present and future, in chairing the Peacebuilding Commission.

I would like to take this opportunity to talk not about peacebuilding in theory but peacebuilding in practice, and in particular I will draw some lessons about peacebuilding from a country that has played a prominent role in my own career, Bosnia and Herzegovina. Nearly 20 years ago I served in the British delegation to the Dayton peace talks and later as British Ambassador to Bosnia from 2005 to 2008. I witnessed the progress made in building and sustaining peace following years of bloodshed. Bosnia still faces challenges — dysfunctional politics and high unemployment, to name but two. But as we prepare to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of the Srebrenica genocide, we should also recognize the considerable progress that the country has made since 1995, and we can learn wider lessons from the international community's experience there. I recognize that every conflict is unique and solutions cannot be cut and pasted from one context to another, but I believe that as a Council we can draw four key lessons.

The first is that we need to do even more on conflict prevention. In the Balkans the international community failed to act early. We knew about some of the horrors that were being committed, but lacked the political will to take action. Today, we live in an age of immediately accessible information. We should never claim that we did not know a conflict was brewing. The challenge for the Council, the Peacebuilding Commission and the whole United Nations system is to find the political will to act early. Early action can prevent enormous suffering. It is also cost-effective. Our failure to prevent conflict has contributed significantly to the $19.7 billion in humanitarian needs and nearly 60 million refugees we are now dealing with and has resulted in an $8.5 billion peacekeeping budget.

No conflict-affected State has achieved any of the Millennium Development Goals. As the British economist Paul Collier has said, "War is development in reverse". Given global trends, our ability to eradicate poverty will be wholly dependent on our ability to reduce violent conflict. That is why Goal 16 of the sustainable development goals is so critical.

The second lesson I took from Bosnia is the primacy of a political process in building and sustaining peace. The Dayton Peace Agreement is not perfect, but it ended the war, which featured the worst fighting in Europe since the Second World War, and it gave the country a foundation on which to build. Just as the recent peace operations review recommends, our efforts on peacekeeping and peacebuilding must all start and finish with a political process. For those settlements to stick, they must be sustainable and inclusive, with women's involvement throughout, and they must be properly funded. In 2012, only 4 per cent of all overseas development aid to fragile States was spent on promoting inclusive politics. The majority is spent on reconstruction and service delivery. We need to recognize that peacebuilding and State-building are

not the same thing. The comparative advantage of the United Nations lies in forging and sustaining political deals to create the space for effective State-building, and that should be the primary focus of any political or peacekeeping mission.

The third lesson is the need for sustained attention and patience from the international community in building a lasting peace. Nearly 20 years on from Dayton, the Council, the European Union, NATO and many others continue to support Bosnia's transition to a peaceful and prosperous State. Countries in the region also have a constructive role to play. Too often, however, our attention drifts. In 2011, Sierra Leone was categorized as an aid orphan by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. International aid fell away, and Sierra Leone was punished for its success in reducing conflict. The spread of Ebola to Sierra Leone last year showed how fragile peacebuilding gains can be and how easily they are rolled back. So we must learn that there are no shortcuts to building durable, national institutions. It takes time. The World Bank estimates that making meaningful improvements to institutions takes between 10 and 17 years at a minimum. Long-term, predictable support is crucial.

The United Kingdom is playing its part. We have kept our promise to spend 0.7 per cent of our gross national income on overseas aid, at least 30 per cent of which will go to conflict-affected States. We are the second-largest financial contributor to the United Nations system, and we are the largest contributor to the Peacebuilding Fund, having provided $82 million since 2011.

My final reflection from Bosnia is that the international community cannot want peace more than the people themselves. Political elites must rise above political, ethnic and religious divides and make tough choices in order to consolidate peace and move forward. Bosnia's leaders still grapple with that challenge, as do the leaders of many of the countries on the Council's agenda. But should they prove that they can overcome their differences, the Council must be poised and ready to give them its full support.

Mr. Oyarzun Marchesi (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank the Ambassadors of Sweden and Brazil for their helpful briefings and for the report of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) on its eighth session (S/2015/174), which covers its work during 2014.

I will speak only briefly, since the full text of my statement will appear on the website of the Spanish mission. I will therefore address two main points — first what I found most interesting in the report, and then the issues that Spain considers to be peacebuilding priorities during its time on the Council — in other words, how we can make a difference from our seat on the Council.

The Ambassador of the United Kingdom said rightly that peacebuilding takes time. That is true, and it is very important. It can take years or decades. I would add that it takes time and money. We need significant financial resources in order to build peace. I believe there is no better investment than an investment in peacebuilding, because there is nothing more expensive than a State's relapse into conflict. The best investment the international community can make in a State is ensuring its stability. The worst investment is failing to provide the necessary resources and thus allowing a State to relapse into conflict once more. Unfortunately, history is littered with instances where, due to lack of investment or attention, countries have relapsed into conflict. I therefore believe it is vital that we find ways to create financing systems for facilitating something that is fundamental, but very difficult to achieve — financial predictability and annual commitments. The Peacebuilding Fund must have sufficient resources to address situations where, for one reason or another, there is instability that could lead to a State's relapse into conflict.

That is my first point. The second, as I said, is sharing with the Council some of Spain's objectives for its two-year membership of the Council, of which four are key.

The first is strengthening preventive action. The Council is aware that Spain, together with Turkey, launched the Alliance of Civilizations, which has functioned splendidly as an instrument of preventive diplomacy. Next week, we will adopt a new resolution on it by consensus, which should be a further step forward in consolidating the Alliance's role as a powerful instrument for combating conflict situations.

Secondly, we will work to make greater use of mediation. With Morocco, we launched a mediation initiative in the Mediterranean region, and we recently held a meeting in Madrid whose outcome will be circulated to all of the States Members of the United Nations so they can see the results in detail.

Thirdly, we are one of the biggest supporters there is of the concept of the responsibility to protect. Two days ago, a meeting of focal points on the responsibility to protect took place in Madrid.

Another of our goals is strengthening regional factors. In our view, when a State is emerging from conflict, there can be no better instrument for restoring it and preventing its relapse into conflict than the region itself. A region is able to help, to overcome obstacles to trade and establish a protection mechanism that can enable a State to definitively re-establish stability.

Fourthly, we believe in the importance of justice. The fact is that we cannot conceive of peace without justice, nor can reconciliation be achieved without it. All of those concepts are closely intertwined, and that is why Spain has always been a staunch defender of the International Criminal Court. We will spare no effort to promote its work.

A fifth goal that Spain will promote is working to achieve the thoughtful convergence of four mechanisms that are already established and under way. The first is the peace operations review process, which must, of course, include the vital component of an exit strategy for peacekeeping operations. The second is the Peacebuilding Commission's review of its own architecture. The third is the review of the important resolution 1325 (2000), on which we are working very productively with the delegation of the United Kingdom. We hope that a new resolution will be adopted on 22 October. The fourth is the post-2015 development agenda, which, we should remember, includes goals for peacebuilding that we should be bearing in mind.

In conclusion, Spain will attempt to help, to the extent possible, to promote the work of the Peacebuilding Commission, because we consider it to be the body that is best positioned to provide continued support to post-conflict countries. It is therefore also the best early-warning mechanism for preventing such States from relapsing into conflict or instability.

Mrs. Ogwu (Nigeria): I want to thank you, Mr. President, for convening this briefing. I thank Ambassador Olof Skoog, Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and Ambassador Antonio de Aguiar Patriota for their very insightful perspectives. We are greatly indebted to all the Chairs of the country-specific configurations and the Peacebuilding Support Office for their commitment to advancing the work of the PBC.

Today's briefing underlines the critical importance of the PBC as an invaluable intergovernmental mechanism for organizing and promoting international support to countries emerging from conflict. It highlights the several challenges that continue not only to reduce the effectiveness of the PBC but also to hinder peacebuilding efforts in countries on its agenda.

The Security Council has a role and indeed a responsibility to support the PBC in implementing its mandate. To contribute to that effort, there must be a clear perception of the gaps and challenges in the PBC's support for the countries on its agenda. There are several gaps in institution-building efforts, especially in such areas as reforming the security sector, strengthening the rule of law, supporting national dialogue, promoting community reconciliation, encouraging disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, enhancing women's empowerment and tackling unemployment.

The common thread that runs through these areas is a lack of adequate, predictable and assured financing for peacebuilding. That underscores the compelling need for the PBC to continue to explore and develop robust strategies for resource mobilization in order to implement its very important mandate. This is why we believe that the Commission's second annual session, held only two days ago, was critical for highlighting measures at our disposal for mobilizing financing for peacebuilding.

It is our view that domestic sources of financing for peacebuilding can be improved by strengthening States' capacities to effectively manage natural resources, design and implement appropriate tax regimes and tax collection, promote transparency and accountability in the management of public resources and curb illicit financial flows. While all of those measures imply more responsibility for Governments, they would also enhance their legitimacy. We encourage wider support for domestic resource generation efforts through the provision of the relevant technical training for experts from those countries.

We believe it is unrealistic to expect that the burden of financing peacebuilding should rest on internally generated revenues from countries emerging from conflict. They will clearly continue to count on financial support from the international community as a demonstration of its commitment to post-conflict recovery.

Making financial contributions to pooled financing mechanisms for peacebuilding is perhaps one way of demonstrating that commitment. Nigeria reaffirms its support for the Peacebuilding Fund as one such pooled financing mechanism. We understand how critically important it is to enhance the application of pooled financing mechanisms, because they encourage aid alignment behind Government priorities, foster greater coherence of international responses to complex situations, reduce transaction costs, share risks and strengthen mutual accountability.

Experience demonstrates that national leadership, ownership and inclusivity are central to post-conflict peacebuilding and must be reinforced by the promotion of the inclusive policies so essential to genuine national ownership. We believe that where peacebuilding efforts are rooted in inclusive consultative processes, the State and its institutions have greater legitimacy and are more trusted. On the other hand, the absence of inclusive policies in the wake of conflict all too often results in control of a State being contested and can lead to a violent relapse into conflict.

There is no doubt that State legitimacy and the rebuilding of State institutions in the aftermath of conflict are vital and critical to the attainment of sustainable peace. That is why, in our view, the security sector and justice institutions must be accorded special attention as organs for the protection of the population and the defence of the State. We call on all partners to support capacity-building for the police, improving prison conditions and strengthening justice institutions in States that are emerging from conflict in order to ensure some measure of sustainable peace.

Nigeria welcomes the priority that the United Nations gives to advancing women's participation in post-conflict, political and development processes. It is significant that more women have been appointed as mediators and special envoys by the Secretary-General over the past five years. Since women are disproportionately affected by conflicts and in conflicts, it is appropriate that women mediators, who can relate better to other women, are involved in the search for peace.

As a keen contributor to global, regional and subregional peacekeeping operations and peacebuilding efforts, Nigeria is encouraged by the focus of the ongoing 2015 review of the peacebuilding architecture. We welcome the emphasis on strengthening relationships with the African Union and other subregional organizations. I listened intently to the statement of the Ambassador of Spain, who has so eloquently highlighted this. I believe that enhanced synergy between the PBC and regional and subregional organizations would bolster our collective efforts.

It is our hope that the five case studies, all of them on the African continent, will yield valuable peacebuilding lessons derived from the experiences of the countries concerned.

We want to affirm and reaffirm our strong support for the PBC, and we remain fully committed to its objectives. We urge Member States and all stakeholders to strengthen their engagement with the Commission, since doing so would greatly improve its capacity to contribute to the building of a safer, more secure and peaceful world.

Mr. Taula (New Zealand): We thank the representatives of Brazil and Sweden.

New Zealand welcomes this opportunity to discuss the annual report of the Peacebuilding Commission (S/2015/174). We support the report's recommendations, in particular those focused on increasing the interactivity between the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and the Security Council. New Zealand believes there is great value in improved information flows between the two bodies, especially in order to improve the management of United Nations mission transitions. Most importantly, there should be more effective cooperation and coordination by United Nations actors on ground. We look forward to discussing these ideas further this afternoon.

New Zealand also commends the report's recommendation that a strategy be developed to strengthen gender perspectives in country-specific engagement. We believe that broader engagement with women will have far-reaching, positive effects on peacebuilding efforts and that this should go beyond extractive engagement.

There are important lessons to be learned from recent and current drawdowns. We would like to highlight four.

First, we believe peacebuilding is a process, not an event, which must accompany and not simply follow peacekeeping. The goals, milestones and priorities should be aligned as much as possible.

Secondly, effective transition planning must be linked to peace operations mandates and therefore must be considered at the earliest stages of mission planning. Measurable benchmarks can play a helpful role in objectively assessing progress, although those must be jointly owned and flexibly applied.

Thirdly, missions tasked with targeted capacity-building can play an important role, but face challenges in ensuring effectiveness and sustainability of outcomes. There is much we can learn from recent experience — for example, regarding options for rapidly sourcing the necessary expertise as well as mechanisms for enabling meaningful national ownership and more sustainable outcomes.

Fourthly, transition management should proceed in partnership between the United Nations and the host Government in close consultation with bilateral, regional and international partners and development actors. The focus of such efforts has to be in-country.

Finally, we note the broader review of the peacebuilding architecture and the reviews of peace operations and resolution 1325 (2005). New Zealand strongly supports those reviews and believes that through them we can strengthen the United Nations management of peace operations and peacebuilding.

Mr. Iliichev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We thank the delegation of Malaysia for organizing today's meeting on peacebuilding issues. We are grateful to the former and current Chairs of the Peacebuilding Commission for their informative briefings and skilful leadership of the Commission.

Peacebuilding support is one of the key instruments the United Nations has for settling conflict effectively, stabilizing post-conflict situations and preventing relapses into armed conflict. We believe the principal responsibility for setting priorities and implementing reconstruction strategy lies with national Governments, and the relevant international efforts should focus on enhancing the institutional capacity of the affected countries, with their consent and while respecting their national sovereignty and political independence.

However, we must not limit peacebuilding to State-building and rebuilding Government institutions, because it is a complex and multifaceted process that includes, beyond its political aspects, assistance with economic development and the resolution of acute social problems. Furthermore, we consider it counterproductive, in the post-conflict context, to overemphasize gender and human rights issues that have no direct bearing on the root causes of the crisis.

Russia supports the Peacebuilding Commission's efforts to enhance the effectiveness and coordination of international support to post-conflict countries by the United Nations.

We take note of the Commission's report on its eighth session (S/2015/174). Last year was a busy one. We note the new trend of holding information sessions regularly, which, in our view, are open and informative in nature. That confirms that the Commission's unique dialogue platform has great potential for enabling intergovernmental discussion of urgent themes and cross-cutting peacebuilding issues. However, we believe that such discussion should not exceed the Commission's mandate by taking on issues that are already being considered by specialized bodies within the General Assembly structure.

We note the completion of the comprehensive review of the peacebuilding architecture, based on the modalities agreed on by Member States. We assume that the expert group has conducted an objective investigation and will submit, as soon as possible, a balanced recommendation for inter-State consideration that will help increase the effectiveness of the Commission as an intergovernmental consultative body playing a central role in the peacebuilding architecture of the United Nations, while strictly respecting the Charter-based prerogatives of the Organization.

The Commission has continued to work hard to support the countries on its agenda, including through its country-specific configurations. However, it would appear that despite producing individual examples of successful results, the Commission has not fully realized its potential. The continued fragmentation of peacebuilding support, including the financing of efforts in post-conflict reconstruction, has had negative effects in Burundi, the Central African Republic and South Sudan. In particular, the early positive trend in Burundi in addressing post-conflict issues of peacebuilding to ensure peace, security and stability has been threatened, including by the use of the financial support for electoral processes as a lever for putting pressure on the national Government. Other examples of crises include the Central African Republic and South Sudan, where there has been an unjustified and often externally imposed re-alignment of peacebuilding

priorities, characterized by an irrational and excessive disbursement of already limited resources.

The outbreak of the Ebola virus was a test of the soundness of the foundation that the Peacebuilding Fund had laid for peace and security in countries such as Sierra Leone, Guinea and Liberia. In a very short period of time it made use of its expert capacity, and the Commission was able to adapt to the needs of those States and contribute to international efforts to address that crisis. We also note the coordinated financial support by the Peacebuilding Fund to countries affected by the Ebola virus.

Mrs. Kawar (Jordan) (*spoke in Arabic*): I would like to thank Mr. Olof Skoog, Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and Mr. Antonio de Aguiar Patriota, its former Chair, for their briefings on peacebuilding in post-conflict situations.

Recent changes and emerging challenges, along with their impact in many areas of the world, have required that the international community and the United Nations acquire the necessary tools to deal with them. Because challenges and threats continue well after conflicts have ended, peacebuilding in the post-conflict stage is an essential aspect of peace and security operations at the national and international levels. Signed peace agreements require the presence of a solid mechanism to ensure that peace will last and to deal with repercussions in the State concerned and in the region, so as to ensure that the country does not relapse into conflict and is in a position to recover its capacity to manage its own affairs and assume its responsibilities. None of that can be done without the presence of a genuine partnership between the international community and the national authorities and communities within countries emerging from conflict. Such cases require diplomacy more than military intervention.

Since the current situation requires the review and development of peacebuilding measures in post-conflict countries, it is essential that peacebuilding operations be adapted to the needs of individual States. Furthermore, certain components must be put in place so they can be responded to appropriately.

First, the training and the support of elements from within the United Nations are needed, and capacities required to meet unconventional challenges, such as terrorism and cross-border crime, must be defined.

Secondly, the clear differences that exist among States, whether in relation to the nature of conflicts or national capacities to respond to threats, mean that we must ensure national ownership in peacebuilding, that capacity-building can happen and that the national resources exist to ensure countries' medium- and short-term development.

Thirdly, there is also the matter of building trust between the United Nations and national authorities and local communities, another important factor in ensuring peacebuilding. It could take the form of specific steps such as service-based projects to provide resources to the country.

Fourthly, complex threats emerge during and after conflicts and often cross national borders. They require a multidimensional response in which governmental, regional and subregional organizations should take part in order to strengthen and ensure peacebuilding. Despite the progress achieved in peacebuilding in a certain number of countries such as Sierra Leone and Burundi, such efforts still need to be aligned with needs and with the efforts of the United Nations itself.

The United Nations should take a leadership role in peacebuilding, particularly since that role is still not sufficiently defined. For example, there is no clear strategy for implementing peacebuilding. We believe that the relevant context and political support to national States are both essential, which means that collective action based on clear plans is needed.

Moreover, the issue of mobilizing financial resources remains a challenge for peacebuilding. The United Nations, donors and international partners such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund must provide the necessary financial and technical support and expertise for peacebuilding, which means that certain elements must be included. Stability must be created by ensuring the rule of law, guaranteeing human rights, bringing criminals to justice and ensuringing accountability. That means building the pillars needed to enable previous international sanctions to be lifted, if the conditions exist.

Complementarity between the processes of security and development is also needed. That requires the reconstruction of institutions, with priority accorded to economic and social issues. It is also necessary to mobilize resources by involving the private sector, to ensure lasting development. Certain illegal financial flows must be ended.

Jordan accords great importance to the work being undertaken by the Peacebuilding Commission, including its advisory role for the Security Council, and its positive participation that we have witnessed in Liberia and Sierra Leone following the down-sizing there of the role of peacekeeping. We reaffirm the importance of providing support to all national, regional and international players in order to further strengthen the Peacebuilding Commission so it can meet the challenges of peacebuilding in an effective way — not after the withdrawal of peacekeeping operations, but from the very beginning of a conflict.

We support the committee that is reviewing peacebuilding and hope the result will be a strategic vision for designing response and implementation measures for security and development plans in all their aspects.

Jordan expects that the consideration by the United Nations of its commitment in the peacebuilding stage will include sending expert missions to work in post-conflict countries, with clear mandates defined by the Organization.

Mr. Lamek (France) (*spoke in French*): I thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this important meeting. I would also like to thank Ambassadors De Aguiar Patriota and Skoog for their illuminating briefings.

Since it was establishd 10 years ago, the peacebuilding architecture has made undeniable progress — on the one hand in the sense of a better understanding of the specific challenges faced by countries emerging from conflict, and on the other in improved coordination of international efforts, particularly on the part of United Nations entities. The report we are considering today (S/2015/174) specifically illustrates the way in which those efforts have made it possible to improve situations on the ground. I am thinking in particular of the partnership with the Peacebuilding Fund promoting greater inclusion of women in Liberia, or of the support provided to the establishment of the new Parliament in Guinea.

Echoing Ambassadors De Aguiar Patriota and Skoog, France would like to recognize the commitment of the peacebuilding architecture in the fight against Ebola, a crisis that gravely impacted three countries on the Commission's agenda. Forced to redirect its priorities, the Commission made every effort to raise awareness with respect to the multidimensional effort needed to combat Ebola, which had public health, social, economic,and political consequences. To have been content with a medical response alone, however crucial, would not have made it possible to adequately address the very real challenges posed by a lack of infrastructure, weak health-care systems and the population's lack of awareness of the public health challenges. We are therefore pleased to see that the peacebuilding architecture can make a difference and can help countries to emerge from crisis.

Further progress can still be made in our collective efforts. The ability to mobilize long-term resources and coordinate among a range of donors to support strategies defined by host States remains a challenge that has yet to be satisfactorily addressed. The cases of countries emerging from conflict that relapse into crisis situations reveal the shortcomings on which we still have more work to do.

With that in mind, France supports the review of the peacebuilding architecture, whose linkage to the strategic review of peacekeeping operations and the review of the implementation of resolution 1325 (2000) is vital. Those reviews allow a critical review of the totality of United Nations peacekeeping endeavours in countries in crisis or emerging from crisis, across the whole spectrum of conflicts, from prevention to post-conflict stabilization, including peacekeeping and the management of transitional phases. Institutional reconstruction, the re-establishment of functional State structures, national reconciliation, transitional justice and economic recovery are challenges that take years, sometimes even decades, to deal with. Crisis management is one thing; addressing such conflicts in the long term is another, and in that regard we have made enormous progress.

In that context, I would like to highlight several points that we consider central. First, it is essential to be firmly anchored on the ground, in specifics and in local situations, in order to provide a tailored response and to support national processes. Moreover, the real work of the Peacebuilding Commission takes place in country-specific configurations, which is where it can best be achieved. Organizational reflection is important but should always support country configurations. In that regard, France welcomes the initiative of the Central African Republic configuration, thanks to which a donor mobilization meeting was held to support that country's elections.

Secondly, it is critical that we develop our thinking and efforts with regard to sequencing and prioritizing international action. We must work on the interrelationship among the different United Nations missions and the forms of engagement, as well as on mission succession. France is grateful to Japan for its initiative on lessons learned in mission transitions.

Thirdly and lastly, we can only agree with the Peacebuilding Commission regarding the importance of the regional dimension. The States that are neighbours of post-crisis countries are key players with whom we must work closely, because crisis issues very often transcend national borders. Cooperation with regional and subregional organizations must also be enhanced, and France welcomes the high priority given to that area in the work this year.

The report of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations, chaired by President Ramos-Horta, was submitted a few days ago, and we are awaiting the imminent submission of the report of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture, coordinated by Ambassador Rosenthal, and the submission in September of the report of the High-level Advisory Group for a Global Study on Resolution 1325 (2000). Those reviews are a unique opportunity to consider the whole chain linking peace, security and development in the context of the United Nations summit to adopt the post-2015 development agenda. We will collectively examine the results of these strategic revieews and actively engage in the implementation of the relevant recommendations.

Mr. Méndez Graterol (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): We are grateful for the convening of this meeting on post-conflict peacebuilding and for the presentations of Ambassador Antonio de Aguiar Patriota and Ambassador Olof Skoog.

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela wishes to acknowledge the work of the Peacebuilding Commission in promoting and maintaining political attention, mobilizing resources and fostering coherence among the various agencies of the United Nations in order to improve the stability and development of the countries on its agenda. We note with appreciation the report of the Commission on its eighth session (S/2015/174). We would also like to recognize the work of the Peacebuilding Fund in allocating $99.4 million to 16 countries in 2014. We note that since the Fund was established, it has distributed more than $500 million to more than 20 countries, thereby contributing to their security and development.

Peacebuilding requires long-term international political, financial and technical support. Lack of funding and political support in areas critical to peacebuilding, with particular emphasis on the underlying causes of crises, poses a significant challenge to international efforts to prevent the relapse of countries emerging from conflicts.

The case of South Sudan reflects the consequences of a lack of sustained political, financial and technical support. According to the Secretary-General's report of September 2014 on peacekeeping in the aftermath of conflict (S/2014/694), "sustained international support was lacking".

> "Successive United Nations missions and the country team received limited support for efforts to support the development of the State's institutional capacity and improve mechanisms of governance. ... Successive attempts at disarmament, demobilization and reintegration lacked sufficient funding and political support as well as approaches better suited to the political context." (*ibid., paras 17 and 18*)

There is often a discrepancy between needs at the national level and the actions of international donors. National involvement in and ownership of peacebuilding priorities, which must be defined by the host country on the basis of political consensus, are essential. As the Secretary-General points out in the same report in relation to South Sudan, the fragmented security sector interventions from international, regional and subregional actors did not work properly because they were not grounded in a national vision for State reform.

We are aware of the need to guarantee sustained funding by the international community for peacebuilding objectives, processes and institutions throughout the continuum of post-conflict engagement. We note, for example, in the Secretary-General's 2014 report on peacebuilding, that the United Nations is expanding its partnerships and collaboration with international financial institutions, including regional development banks, to support post-conflict recovery and promote coherence and long-term financial assistance. While we welcome the initiative, we can only express a certain amount of caution on the basis of our national and regional experience. We mention in

that regard that, historically, funds from international financial institutions have been accompanied by conditions disadvantageous to States and that although such funds can resolve short-term problems or financial needs, they harm long-term development.

Venezuela emphasizes that all developed countries must honour their governmental commitments in the area of official development assistance. We also reiterate the call for donors and institutions in the developed world to undertake to provide more such assistance and more unconditional debt-relief programmes. In particular, the mechanisms designed to ensure that countries receiving assistance use the funds in accordance with national development policies must be enhanced. Such assistance is essential to peacebuilding processes.

A new South-South development paradigm based on cooperation, the sovereign equality of States, complementarity and solidarity has resulted in significant progress in financing for development and could be effective in the funding of peacebuilding processes. We therefore support such cooperation, which we see as complementing North-South cooperation.

Venezuela agrees that the local capacity to mobilize peacebuilding resources must be enhanced by establishing national institutions for revenue generation and financial management. A sustainable source of resource mobilization and internal expenditure is essential for establishing State legitimacy, but, like South-South cooperation, it cannot replace North-South assistance. Developing countries, particularly those on the road to peacebuilding, need the sustained political, financial and technical support of developed countries.

In that connection, it is absolutely essential that the interests and priorities of host countries be protected in the negotiation of contracts with multinational mining companies. We therefore welcome the initiative of the Development Bank of Southern Africa to establish a fund of $22 million to assist African countries in the negotiation of contracts in the area of natural resources. That and much more is needed

My country looks forward to the report of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture, and trusts that that process will result in substantive initiatives to address the underlying causes of conflicts, including poverty, inequality, the legacies of colonialism, foreign interference, economic dependency, illegal exploitation of natural resources, and power imbalances that affect the negotiation of contracts for the mining of such resources.

Ms. Sapag Muñoz de la Peña (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): We would like to thank the former Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, Ambassador Antonio de Aguiar Patriota, and of course the current Chair, Ambassador Olof Skoog, for their presentations. We value their assessment of the work and progress of the Commission and the challenges facing it.

We have taken careful note of the line separating the problems that the Security Council can and must address from those that are not part of its responsibilities. In that light, we feel that the Peacebuilding Commission can play a useful role in such areas, complementing the Council's work.

Chile fully supports the work of the Peacebuilding Commission precisely because it is capable of guiding peace processes and supporting political transitions and institution-building, and not just in the immediate aftermath of conflict. The Commission can, at its full potential, function as a tool for preventing conflicts and their recurrence, thereby contributing to the work of the Security Council. The re-establishment of the rule of law and the strengthening of national institutions and the role of civil society in peacebuilding through processes intended for those purposes, funded by the Peacebuilding Fund and supported by the country configurations, make it possible to create conditions in which the root causes of conflicts can be attacked.

The Commission can also function as an early-warning tool. In practical terms, it could develop preventive diagnostics that would enable it to address the underlying causes of political, social and cultural destabilization, all of them factors that can lead to the outbreak and recurrence of conflicts. It is extremely important that the Commission be able to identify and address issues of social exclusion and economic, political and cultural problems and those related to gender and religion, as well as those stemming from intolerance and violent extremism.

In 2015 Chile became a member of the Peacebuilding Commission's Organizational Committee for the fifth time. This year we join it as a member of the Security Council, enabling us to see the interaction between the two bodies close up. In our view, it is vital that the Council and the Commission support each other, and we hope that the interactive dialogue to be held this

afternoon will enable us to find opportunities for closer cooperation while avoiding duplication of tasks.

We also hope that the report on the second review process of the Commission's architecture will provide new insights that can help it to consolidate and deepen its advisory and consultative role, while recognizing the need for synergies between its review process and those related to peacekeeping operations and the Global Study on the Implementation of Resolution 1325 (2000), on women and peace and security. Chile is a co-Chair of the Group of Friends of the Global Study, and we hope its recommendations will be taken up by the system.

In conclusion, and faced as we are with a complex international scenario, we urge that we continue working to coordinate the mechanisms that can enable us to follow up the issues on the Council's agenda. Our longstanding relationship with the Commission has shown us that progress can be achieved, but also the limitations the Commission faces in reaching its full potential. We believe it is a mechanism that deserves our support, and in that regard, I am pleased to report that my country hopes to continue its strong support for the Peacebuilding Commission and Peacebuilding Fund.

Mr. Liu Jieyi (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): I would like to thank Ambassadors Patriota and Skoog for their briefings.

Establishing a peacebuilding architecture has been extremely important to the ability of the United Nations to effectively fulfil its obligations under its Charter. As the primary entity of that architecture, the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) has actively coordinated the international community's support to countries emerging from conflict, intensified its contributions to peacekeeping, supported the countries of West Africa in responding appropriately to the Ebola epidemic, promoted a comprehensive review of the peacebuilding architecture and generally done a great deal of productive work.

A couple of days ago the PBC successfully held its annual session, during which there were in-depth discussions on such topics as financing for peacebuilding, and significant consensus was reached. Today we are seeing traditional and non-traditional security threats intertwined, with conflicts in some countries spilling over to others in a major way, while some post-conflict countries are dealing with the risk of relapse back into conflict. Consolidating the peace that has already been achieved in such countries and attaining comprehensive economic and social development — these are the issues that the international community must reflect on in depth.

At the beginning of this year, the Security Council and General Assembly jointly launched a comprehensive review of the peacebuilding architecture of the United Nations, aimed at further improving our peacebuilding efforts and promoting the PBC's comprehensive implementation of the mandates of the Council and the Assembly. In that regard, I would like to make the following points about our peacebuilding work.

First, it is essential that we insist on ownership by the countries concerned, since that represents the foundation of peacebuilding efforts and the best way to ensure results. The international community should respect the sovereignty and ownership of the host countries, intervening only at their request and supporting them in accordance with the priorities and road maps formulated by them. It is important to focus on strengthening communication with host countries and to make timely adjustments that accord with their views.

Secondly, it is important to tailor interventions so they can adapt to changing circumstances. Post-conflict countries can find themselves in many different situations, and peacebuilding efforts should therefore come up with strategies that are country-specific, based on the circumstances and needs prevailing in individual host countries. Social reconciliation and economic and social development are key to ensuring lasting peace, and should be a natural focus for peacebuilding. While work can also be done in other areas, it should accord with host countries' needs and does not have to be all-embracing, thus avoiding the mistakes of efforts that are penny-wise and pound-foolish.

Thirdly, it is important to strengthen the PBC's coordinating role. The Commission's work covers a range of areas, including peace, security, development and society, in which there are many important participants, such as host country Governments, the various social sectors, United Nations agencies — particularly the Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council — international and regional organizations and international financial institutions. There is a need for a division of labour as well as coordination among the various participants. It is to

be hoped that the PBC will strengthen its coordination among the parties in the field of peacebuilding so that they can play to their respective strengths, in accordance with their mandates, and form synergies.

Fourthly, it is important to ensure that the Commission's advisory function is fully realized. The PBC has a great amount of information at its disposal, as well as a deep understanding of such subjects as how to consolidate peace and strengthen host countries' capacities and institution-building. The Commission should therefore continue to strengthen its relations with the Council and provide it with active advice. The Council, for its part, should also improve its coordination with the Commission and its various country configurations so as to arrive at the kind of comprehensive understanding that will enable it to provide guidance on its peacebuilding efforts.

Mr. Mangaral (Chad) (*spoke in French*): I would like to congratulate the Malaysian presidency on its organization of today's meeting on peacebuilding and to thank Mr. Antonio de Aguiar Patriota, the former Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, and Mr. Olof Skoog, the current Chair, for their statements.

Chad takes note of the Commission's report on its work during 2014 (S/2015/174), welcomes its activities and encourages it to continue to carry out its vital functions. In that regard I have the following comments to make.

Regarding the issue of financial resources, the Commission should put greater emphasis on enhancing public income and combating illicit financing flows so as to promote the direct participation of the countries concerned in peacebuilding efforts. In Liberia, for instance, where the lack of financial resources and insufficient national revenue base have continued to hinder progress in the areas of the rule of law and security sector reform, the Commission could work harder to mobilize more significant support for managing the country's natural resources. We should establish global policies aimed at limiting and mitigating the effects that the illicit flight of capital can have on countries and at supporting capacity-building in public finances and the creation of national revenue. Ongoing support in that area would allow those countries to generate a more significant part of the financial resources necessary for re-establishing economic infrastructure and providing basic services. We note the areas in which new policies could be designed to help countries emerging from conflict, including the capacity to negotiate contracts related to national resources; the transparency and responsibility of mining companies, and the tax regimes to be applied; the establishment of international mechanisms to strengthen mutual responsibility and international cooperation on tax issues, against tax evasion and trade distortion; and the fight against banking secrecy laws, which promote the illicit movement of funds.

In terms of the national ownership of initiatives, the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) must focus the international community's attention on the priorities of the countries concerned. In that way, it could support the implementation of the Government projects in Guinea-Bissau aimed at establishing a national peacebuilding strategy and continue to promote the coordination and harmonization of the support given to the country's priority goals. The Commission could do the same in Guinea, since the Government has made its priorities known with regard to peacebuilding and human rights. In Burundi, the Commission could focus on the continued enhancement of social cohesion and the speedy implementation of the development programme established by the Government. Finally, in Sierra Leone, the Peacebuilding Commission could continue to work to promote the country's efforts to ensure durable peace.

I wish to highlight the importance of regional perspectives in the context of the work of the Commission, because the role and functions of the United Nations and regional actors are complementary in nature. In that regard, countries that are neighbours of those on the Peacebuilding Commission's agenda, the African Union and other organizations must be major partners in political processes and the combat against factors that promote instability. It is therefore vital that the Commission enhance its cooperation and establish closer ties with those countries and the African Union. For example, the Central African Republic continues to enjoy the region's support for the peaceful settlement of the crisis.

At the bilateral level, and in the context of a subregional effort, Chad, along with other countries members of the Economic and Monetary Community of Central Africa, contributed on several occasions to the payment of civil servants' salaries in the Central African Republic. The Commission could enhance its support for regional initiatives promoting an ongoing political dialogue that is open to all countries emerging

from conflict, and cooperate in such efforts. We pay tribute to the efforts of the African Union to deal with the problems caused by financial flows, and we support the adoption of a regional approach to deal with that challenge. Chad also reasserts its support for the African Union's common position on the comprehensive review of the peacebuilding architecture in 2015. We encourage the review to strengthen the contribution made by the United Nations peacebuilding architecture to the African Union's peace and development objectives and to make recommendations in that regard.

Concerning the Peacebuilding Commission's advisory role for the Security Council, we encourage the Commission to continue to look at ways of enhancing that role and improving its relations with the Council, particularly with regard to the issues of United Nations missions in transition and repeated relapse into conflict. We believe the Commission's advisory role should be seen in a strategic light and should enhance the political strategy of the Council and the United Nations in given situations. We also believe that the dialogue between these two entities should be based on flexibility and the absence of any formalities, with the participation of ambassadors and Council country experts, as well as the active follow-up of Council deliberations by the PBC. We favour making informal contacts with individual countries before the Council takes any steps, particularly when reviewing mandates.

The Peacebuilding Commission should insist on the participation of women in peacebuilding and encourage the adoption of measures relating to their economic empowerment. We look forward to the recommendations of the comprehensive high-level review on the implementation of resolution 1325 (2000), which will allow us to assess the progress made in enhancing the role of women in post-conflict peacebuilding and any obstacles that may remain.

In conclusion, given the negative impact of the Ebola pandemic in Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone in 2014, we call on the Commission to enhance its capacity to mobilize resources and invite the countries concerned to generate resources at the national level. The Peacebuilding Commission, the Peacebuilding Support Office and the Peacebuilding Fund were created in 2005 with the promise that assistance would be given to countries to prevent them from falling back into violence. We therefore look forward to a review of the progress achieved since 2005, the difficulties encountered in managing post-conflict problems and the recommendations drawn from the review, which should enable the three entities to do a better job. We believe those recommendations should aim at helping to prevent countries emerging from conflict from relapsing into violence, since recent examples of the resurgence of violence, as in the Central African Republic and South Sudan, have made clear the gaps that exist in terms of assistance to peacebuilding.

Mrs. Jakubonė (Lithuania): I thank Ambassador Skoog of Sweden and Ambassador De Aguiar Patriota of Brazil for their comprehensive briefings and personal commitment to the work of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC).

Lithuania recognizes the critical importance of peacebuilding as the foundation for sustainable peace and development in the aftermath of conflict and highly values the contribution of the PBC, the Peacebuilding Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Office in support of post-conflict recovery and peacebuilding in the countries on the PBC agenda. Over the past year, the PBC has further demonstrated its potential in identifying gaps to peacebuilding and ensuring that countries at risk of sliding back into conflict remain on the international community's agenda. The PBC was especially instrumental at the beginning of the Ebola outbreak. The Commission has actively utilized its role as an advocate and in resource mobilization, and has helped to draw the international community's attention to and focus on the risks posed by the Ebola outbreak to the three most affected countries. Its advisory, advocacy and resource mobilization capacity should be further utilized.

Sustained and predictable funding for areas critical to peacebuilding and consolidation is crucial to international efforts to prevent a relapse into violence. Investments in support of political dialogue and the strengthening of security and rule-of-law institutions are essential, both during violent conflict and in its aftermath. Institutional capacity-building is a long-term endeavour and requires targeted and sustained support. We welcome the PBC discussions in that regard on ways to enhance the predictability of peacebuilding funding.

National as well as regional leadership and ownership are crucial to sustainable peacebuilding. We commend the Commission's active engagement with African countries and Africa's regional and subregional organizations, in particular the African Union. It should further promote established partnerships and enhance

synergy, since that contributes to forging greater regional coherence in the post-conflict response.

The PBC should remain actively engaged in support of the political dialogue and other preparatory processes during the electoral periods in the countries on the PBC agenda. We welcome the active engagement of the PBC Burundi configuration in that regard. As the country is experiencing a severe pre-electoral crisis, it is very important that the PBC configuration remain vigilant over the developments in the country.

It is important to further promote the gender dimension of peacebuilding, and we commend the Commission's continuing work in that regard. Women and young people can and should play a very active role both in conflict resolution and in peacebuilding efforts. Women should be in a position to envisage the path to empowerment with full-scale participation in post-conflict social, economic, political and security structures.

We support the advisory role of the PBC and encourage exploring further ways of making better use of the mutually beneficial links between the PBC and the Security Council. The interaction between the two bodies should remain mutually proactive. The PBC should continue to draw the attention of Council members, formally and informally, to emerging threats in the countries on its agenda in order to reduce the risk of emergence or relapse into violent conflict.

Peacebuilding is a long and delicate process involving many actors and different stakeholders. We trust that the ongoing peacebuilding review will draw on past experiences and lessons learned and generate concrete recommendations on how to strengthen the international community's response to the post-conflict situation and build sustainable peace.

Mr. Lucas (Angola): We welcome Ambassador Antonio de Aguiar Patriota, former Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, and thank him for presenting the Commission's report (S/2015/174). We praise the work that Brazil has been doing for some time as Chair of the Guinea-Bissau configuration and all of the efforts that have been made to ensure a meaningful process of peace consolidation in that brother country. We also welcome and thank Ambassador Olof Skoog, the Commission's current Chair.

The Peacebuilding Commission has scored undeniable successes in countries on its agenda. However, we recognize that much remains to be done and that further efforts will be needed to maintain post-conflict gains in some of those countries.

The issue under consideration in today's meeting is critical to ensuring lasting and sustainable peace in countries emerging from conflict. Last year, the United Nations peacebuilding framework deployed substantial resources in support of countries to help them move towards peace consolidation and to strengthen the nexus between security and development. The Peacebuilding Commission pursues its activities based on advocacy, mobilizing resources, strengthening partnerships, forging coherence in policy development and ensuring national ownership of the peacebuilding processes. Additionally, the Commission must strengthen its advisory function with regard to the Security Council and the General Assembly and make its actions more coordinated and incisive.

The Peacebuilding Commission plays a mediating role between the United Nations and the international community by helping countries in post-conflict situations build their national institutions, strengthen social cohesion and carry out structural, social and economic reforms. The Commission also plays a crucial role in helping them to overcome outstanding challenges. In that regard, we mention the Commission's outstanding intervention in assisting Liberia, Guinea and Sierra Leone, the three West African countries most affected by the Ebola outbreak.

With regard to mobilizing resources, the Commission plays a crucial role in assisting in the consolidation of peace and stability. In the case of Guinea-Bissau, for example, it is helping the Government to implement its priority agenda. It also contributed to holding a donor conference for Guinea-Bissau, which took place in March in Brussels with remarkable success. That conference was an example of how the Peacebuilding Commission can strengthen partnerships by playing a key role in bringing together the international community, regional organizations, financial institutions and Member States to address the needs and concerns of the countries on its agenda.

We welcome the Commission's efforts to involve women in peacebuilding processes and to empower and include them in all peacebuilding efforts. Overlooking the contribution of women and the crucial role they can play in peacebuilding and social and economic development is a mistake and a recipe for failure.

Women, youth and civil society organizations are powerful driving forces in peace consolidation processes and in social development in general. The review of resolution 1325 (2000) is an opportunity to take stock of that reality.

As has already been said, the Peacebuilding Commission must strengthen its advisory role with regard to the Security Council and the General Assembly on issues pertaining to post-conflict countries. For instance, in countries with ongoing demobilization, disarmament, reintegration (DDR) and security-sector reform programmes, the Commission must provide pertinent information to the Security Council on the implementation and follow-up of such programmes in order to ensure that ex-combatants are not excluded and to create the best possible conditions for their better integration into civilian life, which is a crucial element in the peace consolidation process.

In countries where the Security Council intends to terminate, draw down or reduce the personnel of a peacekeeping mission, the Peacebuilding Commission must draw the attention of the United Nations and the Security Council to the appropriateness of such moves. The peacekeeping operations review takes into account that fundamental element in strengthening the advisory role of the Commission.

We would like to share Angola's experience as a post-conflict country and to offer some views on aspects that we consider essential to a successful peacebuilding process.

In political terms, in taking into account the principal of national ownership, peacebuilding demands trust and good faith on the part of the main stakeholders and requires that they work to achieve genuine national reconciliation. In Angola, the peace and reconstruction process required, first, the extension of the State's authority to the whole country, institution-building, respect for human rights and the rule of law.

Social and political inclusion is a fundamental feature of any peacebuilding process. The efforts deployed by the Angolan authorities to reach out to former adversaries and integrate them into society are well documented, as is the restoration of State institutions and economic life in general. That was a determining factor in the success of our peace, national reconciliation and reconstruction process. Furthermore, the full participation of political actors, women, young people, civil society and the media in the national debate led to the adoption of constitutional and legal mechanisms associated with peacebuilding.

In social and economic terms, peacebuilding required the reconstruction of all the infrastructure destroyed by the war and especially the restoration of basic services to the population — roads, bridges, railroads, airports, ports, schools and hospitals. The success of the disarmament, demobilization and social reintegration of more than 100,000 members of the military was pivotal to the consolidation of peace, which laid the foundations for sound social and economic recovery. A lot still remains to be done in social and economic development, social democratization and inclusion, but we can say that in general the country is on the right track.

We fully support the review of the peacebuilding architecture, adapting peacebuilding to the dynamics of the situation in each post-conflict country and working more closely with the Security Council, the General Assembly, the United Nations system and regional and subregional organizations in preventing relapses into conflict and working in coordination with regional organizations to consolidate peace and stability. The review of the peacebuilding architecture offers a unique opportunity for a clearer definition of the partnership to be established with the African Union and the African subregional organizations. However, the debate that has been going on for quite some time in the African Union has not yielded tangible results, a shortcoming that we hope the present review will address. In addition, we expect that this year's review of peacekeeping operations will afford a better understanding of the related challenges and insufficiencies and lead to the formulation of recommendations for rendering the cooperation between the peacebuilding architecture and the peacebuilding operations more effective.

Finally, we are of the view that the Security Council, the Peacebuilding Commission and regional organizations should establish a more complementary and tangible partnership in securing peace and security in the world by strengthening the nexus between security and development.

Mr. Pressman (United States of America): I would like to thank Ambassadors Patriota and Skoog for their briefings earlier. I also thank Ambassador Patriota for his work as the outgoing Chair of the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), especially during the outbreak of the Ebola virus in

the three countries on the PBC's agenda. I congratulate Ambassador Skoog, who is doing important work as the 2015 Chair of the Organizational Committee, and the chairs of the country-specific configurations. We are grateful for their efforts to rally support from the international community to assist many of the world's most fragile States in recovering from conflict.

It is clear from the report of the Peacebuilding Commission (S/2015/174) that we have made some progress in preventing conflict and building conditions for lasting peace in some places. The Commission has played a critical role in assisting Guinea-Bissau, helping focus donor engagement and building domestic capacity in the security and health sectors. In Liberia, the Commission's engagement, specifically in the justice and rule of law sectors, has helped build capacity ahead of a planned drawdown of the United Nations Mission in Liberia.

It is also clear that gaps still exist between our collective aspirations for helping fragile States to solidify peace and the realities in practice and on the ground. The purpose for which the peacebuilding architecture was created in 2005 — preventing relapse into violent conflict — remains easy to talk about but hard to do. And it is a challenge for all of us. In places like Burundi and the Central African Republic we are keenly aware of how important it is that the international community sustain and increase our joint efforts.

The PBC has an important role in complementing the work of the Security Council in post-conflict countries on the Commission's agenda — engaging international financial institutions, raising the profile of needs that are not being met and bringing to the attention of Member States issues that could put peace at risk. It is an art, not a science, and each case has unique challenges and unique solutions. There is no single prescription for how to ensure that peace is sustained, but there are key factors that should be of concern to the Peacebuilding Commission.

In the aftermath of the tragic outbreak of Ebola in Sierra Leone, Liberia, Guinea — all countries on the Commission's agenda — the PBC played a critical supportive role in bringing together all the relevant actors to fight the disease, working in concert with the efforts of the Security Council, the relevant United Nations agencies, the United Nations Secretariat and international partners. Weak national capacity in the aftermath of conflict can have devastating consequences, as the outbreak of the Ebola virus demonstrated, and the Peacebuilding Commission must apply itself urgently to bringing together the technical and financial resources required to build post-conflict countries' capacity to meet the needs of their people.

The Peacebuilding Commission has played an important role in refocusing the international community on the immense challenges that remain in the Central African Republic. We are optimistic that the Bangui Forum helped advance that country on its path towards peace. Yet as the Commission has highlighted, the Central African Republic's road ahead will remain difficult, and it requires sustained and significant support from international partners.

We echo the Commission's call to all stakeholders in the Central African Republic to help promote an environment conducive to holding elections, and we echo its concerns about the $21 million gap in the funding for the election's budget. We urge all partners to consider making additional contributions to support elections in the Central African Republic, advance demobilization, disarmament and reintegration efforts and address other urgent priorities essential to that country's stabilization. The Commission continues to play an important leadership and convening role as the Central African Republic advances towards stability, and it must work to ensure that we remain focused on the tasks at hand.

We appreciate the Peacebuilding Commission's special emphasis on engaging regional actors in fragile settings, particularly the neighbours of those countries on the Commission's agenda. The Commission has played a welcome role in encouraging Senegal's engagement in Guinea-Bissau, as well as in promoting a dialogue in the dispute between the two countries over the Casamance region. The Commission has also engaged the members of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) in their planning for long-term stability in Guinea-Bissau, recognizing the essential role of the ECOWAS security mission in Guinea-Bissau in helping to provide stability on the ground. That is critical work, and it should continue.

The Commission must ensure that women are integrated into every step of post-conflict peacebuilding. They must be empowered to make and invest in choices about the future of their societies. Working with the Government of Liberia, the Peacebuilding Commission has ensured the greater involvement of

civil society, including women's groups, in the national reconciliation process, in addition to promoting an increased allocation of funds for gender issues from the Peacebuilding Fund. As a result of the Commission's engagement, Liberia is one of the countries where the allocation of the fund for gender-related issues is higher than the 15 per cent target set by the Secretary-General in his report on women's participation in peacebuilding (S/2010/466).

While we recognize that the Peacebuilding Commission has had some successes over the past year in meeting some of those challenges, it is also critical that we understand the challenges facing it and its work, including those outlined in the recently released report of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations. As documented in that report, the Peacebuilding Commission has not met expectations that its focus would include, importantly, prevention.

By comparison with those provided once a conflict is under way, prevention efforts often lack the necessary attention and resources. Moreover, in contrast to mediation and peacekeeping, the prevention of armed conflict is approached in an ad hoc manner, without cohesion among the actors — diplomatic, political, development or economic. As the Panel's report clearly states, "Put simply, the international community is failing at preventing conflict". Failing to prevent a relapse into crisis is costly, both in terms of human lives and in the time and resources needed after a country has relapsed. It is a failure we cannot afford not to address. The peacebuilding architecture must play a critical role in that effort. In that vein, we welcome the five-year review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture currently under way as a tool for addressing some of those challenges.

The year 2015 is a significant one for United Nations peacebuilding as the international community focuses on the need to pay close attention to the key components of lasting peace after conflict — national ownership, social and political inclusivity, institution-building and predictable financing. We look forward to working with the Peacebuilding Commission, the Peacebuilding Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Office, as well as other United Nations and international actors, on how to best respond to the needs of countries emerging from conflict and to solidify the gains made in countries as they transition to a lasting peace.

The President: I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of Malaysia.

I join the other Council members in thanking Ambassador Olof Skoog, Permanent Representative of Sweden and Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) at its ninth session, for his statement. I am delighted to see Sweden at the helm of the PBC and am confident that under Ambassador Skoog's leadership we will achieve further progress in the Commission's work. I would also like to thank Ambassador Patriota of Brazil for his outstanding leadership of the PBC at its eighth session. His statement and report (S/2015/174) outline many important issues that will continue to dominate our discussions. My appreciation goes to the Peacebuilding Support Office for its unstinting support for and cooperation with the PBC.

The challenges facing international peace and security today are enormously demanding in terms of political attention and the need for resources. Since its establishment, the PBC has demonstrated its contribution particularly in terms of its support for institution-building and strengthening national resilience in times of peace, as well as in providing advice and accompaniment to countries dealing with political difficulties in troubled times.

As a member of both the Security Council and the PBC concurrently, Malaysia has assumed an informal coordinating role between both bodies in order to facilitate better mutual understanding and relations. Today's discussion underscores the need for strengthening strategic partnerships in both bodies in order to deal with, other things, issues such as transitions and the emerging gaps between peacekeeping and peacebuilding, and the engagement of international or regional actors in preventing countries emerging from conflict from relapsing into it.

At the same time, the review of the peacebuilding architecture now under way presents a timely opportunity for the members of the Commission and the wider United Nations membership to take stock and deliberate further on measures aimed at improving the Organization's peacebuilding architecture. We believe that the review of the peacebuilding architecture and its outcome should also take into consideration other review processes, namely, the high-level review of resolution 1325 (2000) on women and peace and security, and the outcome of the United Nations peace operations review. Malaysia believes that the outcome

of those three processes is highly important to the United Nations system. The reviews must be mutually reinforcing if they are to have the desired impact.

We have followed closely the views of Council members on the need for a sharper focus in peacebuilding efforts and in the expertise and financial support required. We look forward to the informal interactive dialogue on that subject later today.

I now resume my functions as President of the Council.

There are no more names inscribed on the list of speakers.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.